

**BUILDING DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION**  
**Minutes of April 19, 2011 Meeting**

Jon Morris opened the Building-Development Commission (BDC) meeting at **3:02 p.m. on Tuesday, April 19th, 2011.**

**Present:** Jon Morris, Ed Horne, Travis Haston, Elliot Mann, Jonathan Wood, Zeke Acosta, Dave Shultz, Bernice Cutler, Will Caulder, Harry Sherrill, Kevin Silva and Hal Hester

**Absent:** Buford Lovett

## **1. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

*The motion by Ed Horne seconded by Jon Wood to approve the March 15th, 2011 meeting minutes passed unanimously.*

## **2. BDC MEMBER ISSUES AND COMMENTS**

- Harry Sherrill asked if the county approved the budget for Code Enforcement. Ruth McNeil stated that it would be June 7<sup>th</sup> before the budget is approved.
- Jon Morris welcomed Hal Hester a new (previous) member of the BDC and asked Hal to introduce himself. Hal shared that he is representing Charlotte Plumbing Heating Cooling Contractors replacing Barry Hanson. He has worked with North Mecklenburg Plumbing Company in Huntersville for more than 35 years.
- Jon Morris spoke about the attendance requirements of board members. He went on to say that after speaking with several of our county commissioners they made a point to talk about BDC attendance. From last year to this year they bumped up the requirement that you have to attend 75% of the meetings; which means BDC board members can only have three (3) absences. There were a couple of folks that didn't meet that criterion and the county commissioners made a big deal out of it this year. Typically Jon will submit a letter stating why a BDC member missed. The BOCC says ok, fine and you can be reappointed if you want to be reappointed. This year there were a couple of county commissioners that put their foot down and said if you can't make 75% of the meetings you don't need to be on the Building Development Commission. Jon went on to say, these are volunteer positions, when business calls you have to go take care of your business. This year with any committee attendance not only if it's BDC or any appointed committee they are looking at that a little bit harder.
- Travis Haston asked Gene Morton about residential framing inspections and when does the building inspector on a rough frame have the ability to request a reinspection of an engineer to inspect an engineered crane job? Had a recent incident where I called in a framing inspection and I was turned down and required to have the engineer come out and inspect the work performed before he would pass it with a letter. In turn what it's doing is costing money that I've got to eat because I've already submitted the change orders to the customer for the engineering aspect of the job. It's a 3 story townhouse and it was all trusses from wall to wall and we came in and rearranged 3 stories (approx. 6,000sf) and didn't know what we had until we opened everything up and realized that we were going to have to get an engineer out on site to walk us through it to appease the city and structurally and we did that, had it all in front of him when he came out and he said no, you are going to have to get the engineer to come out and write a sign off on it or I'm not looking at it. Jon Morris asked if he had a stamped set of plans and he wanted more than that. Trent said he wanted the inspector to inspect the work and say it's all good. To basically do (in my eyes) his job. Harry Sherrill asked did he want the engineer of record to witness what was installed. Trent said he wasn't witnessing anything, he said call the engineer back and have him come out and inspect the work, write me a letter to say it's good to go and I'll pass you. I've never had this come up. Gene Morton said the inspector would need to have a reason. There are some occasions where the inspector will see something specific that is not covered specifically in a letter from an engineer and we've had cases where a second look by an engineer sees it differently and he may ask for something else to be done but the inspector should have given you a reason other than he doesn't feel comfortable signing off on it. If an engineer has covered the situation thoroughly with a letter and/or plans and the inspector has the opportunity to verify whether it's built according to the engineer's design. I can't think of a lot of reasons, maybe we need to see the actual details of this particular project before I

can really answer. Trent said he didn't know if we were just evolving to that and what are the criteria for doing so; but obviously that doesn't sound like the case. Gene said as an example we've had some framing issues before and the inspector may have been uncomfortable with the total project and the engineer came back out and said no I didn't look in the foundation which is where the concern was, he only looked above the floor system for the loading. Gene offered to look into this issue more closely after the meeting.

- Ed Horne thanked Wendell Dixon; he helped Ed out in an unusual situation where he needed to get some information. David Greene in CTAC helped too. These folks really go the 2<sup>nd</sup> mile to help you when you've got an unusual situation like this and I just wanted you guys to know I certainly appreciate it and I'm sure others do as well.

### 3. PUBLIC ATTENDEE ISSUES AND COMMENTS

No public attendee issues or comments.

### 4. SPECIAL STAT REPORT ON REVENUE AND EXPENSES AT 3/31/11

Gene Morton covered our expenses and revenues as of 3-31-2011 referenced in last month's minutes on page 2 of 10.

- **Expenses:** adopted budget was \$13,220,555
  - budgeted expense:  $\$13,220,555/12 \times 9 = \$9,915,413$
  - actual expenses at \$9,765,775, plus encumbered items yet to be spent in FY11
  - about \$247,213 under or 1.9% behind projection (to the good).
- **Revenue:** Total revenue projection of \$13,220,555 breaks down into;
  - permit fees; \$11,328,781
  - other revenue; \$1,641,774
  - tech surcharge transfer; \$250,000
  - Status at 3/31/2011; as recorded in Navision System
    - permit fee revenue; \$8,547,612 vs. projection of \$8,496,585
    - other revenue; \$1,468,411 vs. projection of \$1,231,331
    - tech surcharge collected; \$207,277
    - gross revenue recognized in Navision; \$10,223,300 vs. projection of \$9,915,413
      - above most conservative projection by 227k or 1.72%
  - Status at 3/31/2011; as recorded in Advantage System (see note 1)
    - Gross revenue of \$10.368M vs. projection of \$9.915M
    - **Note 1:** this number includes Plan Review fees for OnSch Projects and Abandoned Projects which require the permit fee to be paid up front. These typically run 300k-500k, but aren't recognized as revenue in Navision and BDC monthly stats, until the project is actually permitted
- **Conclusions:**
  - **Expenses:** at 73.6% of total FY11 expense estimate
  - **Revenue:**
    - Conservatively at 101.72% of totalFY11 revenue estimate
    - But Advantage numbers (more realistic) indicate 104.56% of totalFY11 revenue estimate
  - **Total picture:** considering both expenses and revenue combined, we are at least \$470,000 above balance (to the good), but perhaps closer to \$800-850k above balance.

### 5. CHARLOTTE PLANNING REPORT – Status of SF Exterior Plan Review Proposal by Debra Campbell:

Item #5 has been tabled until the presentation can be rescheduled.

## 6. WEBSITE PRESENTATION ON CUSTOMER REQUESTED CHANGES

Jeff Griffin gave a preview of changes made to the web site. The presentation covered the following web pages:

- <http://charmeck.org/mecklenburg/county/CodeEnforcement/Pages/default.aspx>
- <http://charmeck.org/mecklenburg/county/CodeEnforcement/Contractors-tools/Pages/default.aspx>
- <http://charmeck.org/mecklenburg/county/CodeEnforcement/Inspections/Pages/default.aspx>

New items added to the web site presented to the BDC are as follows:

- New yellow border located in top navigation menu
- Site input per page sent directly to web page owner
- Language translation
- You can search County sites as well as Code Enforcement sites on every page
- Notify Me – a reminder for all to sign up
- Staff directory search by either staff name or the team they are on
- Statistical data has been added under “most requested” on left side of page
- Limitations w/in What’s New so items under this category will rotate every 3 – 6 months
- Inspection Response Time will provide last week’s results
- Banner section on the top for office closings or other special announcements
- Any device you have that has a web browser, now you can see and access the web site
- Professional links, trade association links
- Inspections Services page w/ teams listed and various information available
- Standard Operating Procedures (SOP)

### *Q and A*

**JM:** We implemented the Inspection Response Time for the contractors and subs about 6-12 months ago; has this been a useful tool for your daily business? Ed, on the Electrical side, do your people in the office, do they use this tool?

**EH:** They probably don’t know about it. I look at the Inspection Response Time.

**JG:** That was one of the concerns and we committed to putting this on our main page.

**EH:** I would like to mention to Gary and Joe that we bring this up with the contractors at our next meeting to make everyone aware of this.

**ZA:** On the notification are you making changes that are dropping it out because we keep losing it.

**JG:** Wasn’t aware we were having problems, we will check into it.

**TH:** Did you say there was a mobile application for phones?

**JG:** Yes, you can use a mobile device to schedule you inspections.

**EM:** You’ve shown us a lot of great new things out there and we’re a small group; how are all the customers that use this every day finding out about all the new changes?

**JG:** One of the things that Jim has on his agenda is a memo to customers on the changes. I know that he is drafting this up right now and we did not have that available today but he is working on something to send out electronically to let everyone know about the changes to the website.

### 6.1. Review of Changes Supporting Code Administrators

Joe Weathers gave a presentation covering the following web pages:

- <http://charmeck.org/mecklenburg/county/CodeEnforcement/CodeDefectLibrary/Pages/Electrical.aspx>
- <http://charmeck.org/mecklenburg/county/CodeEnforcement/Electrical/Pages/Electrical%20Interpretations.aspx>
- <http://charmeck.org/mecklenburg/county/CodeEnforcement/Resources/Pages/Consistency.aspx>

Electrical/Building/Mechanical-Plumbing items added and or changed:

- Code Defect Library – pictures of defect examples vs. correct examples
- Consistency Teams – you can submit a consistency issue through the web page
- Link to appeal with outline of the complete appeal process

- Quarterly Reports of all issues discussed in consistency team meetings
- Code Compliance Report
- Electrical interpretations pages will have a menu drop down box to access interpretations
- Site feedback option for all web pages.

#### *Q and A*

**EM:** Is this a new option or has it been here before?

**JW:** It has been here for quite some time and is currently being used.

**EM:** It is an amazing resource and our customers probably don't realize 50% of what is there.

**JW:** Elliot, we as Code Administrators are charged with getting out all the word we can. We attend the Electrical Contractors meeting monthly and put this demonstration on for them to see all the tools they have to work with. I wish there were other venues because we are willing to go.

### **7. STRATEGY ON BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE CONTINUING RESEARCH**

Gene Morton discussed several items that were brought up by the budget subcommittee needing further research and shared the outline of membership as well as other details. He also shared that Jim Bartl will email BDC members requesting private sector volunteers for the Cost Recovery Work Group. BDC Members asked that Jim describe the purpose and explain how the meeting would be scheduled (after introductory meeting) so that volunteers could attend as needed. BDC Members agreed to forward Jim's email to prospective volunteers.

- **Topics to address:** as outlined in the meetings, topics to address include;
  - a) Does the Fee Ordinance work when we have no auto cost calculator (as used in residential) to match up the permit fee with the Department resource level required to service the project?
  - b) Should the Mega project permit fee discount be reduced from 25%, or eliminated?
  - c) Are our costs on small projects and "change-out" work appropriately (or adequately) addressed by the current permit fee structure?
- **Membership**
  - Private sector:
    - Two non-Budget Subcommittee BDC members.
    - 2 GC's, 4 small contractors, MEP trade rep, 2-AE's

Note: develop a meeting schedule and topic outline, to allow involving the appropriate BDC discipline representatives on a meeting topic targeted basis.
  - Staff:
    - All meetings; Directors, Tim T, RS/KB
    - Selected meetings; Luis P, Mary Caulder, Geri W
- **Other details**

BDC Members agreed the best name for the group should be Cost Recovery Work Group.

  - Name: Cost Recovery Work Group (unless BDC wants something different)
  - Meeting schedule; bi-weekly, tri-weekly????
  - Possible meeting topics;
    - Meeting 1; topic intro, all customer ideas, identify research required
    - Meeting 2; Mega project permit fee discount (topic 'b' above)
    - Meeting 3; small projects and "change-out" work (topic 'c' above)
    - Meeting 4; auto cost calculator for other projects (topic 'a' above)
    - Meeting 5; reconvene collective meeting(s) to draft recommendations to BDC
  - Responsible Party: JNB, Patrick Granson, Gene Morton

#### *Q and A*

**JM:** The 25% discount was an incentive to get people to go through the Mega process gateway and now folks understand it might not need the incentive, correct?

**GM:** Yes

**HS:** Electronic Plan Review will take more time initially when you have to open every sheet electronically although it's Jim's opinion that it will be faster.

**BC:** I think that will be a temporary issue. It will go faster as the staff gets used to the process and eventually they will find it just as easy.

**HS:** How you label .pdfs will be quite the learning curve.

## 8. QUARTERLY REPORTS

### 8.1. Technical Advisory Board 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarterly Report

Lon McSwain reviewed and stated the purpose of the last TAB meeting; he reviewed the minutes and gave the board an update that the BCC IgCC will not adopt the green code. The next ICC public hearing will be May 16<sup>th</sup> through the 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011.

- TAB March meeting report.
- Report on CMC Lincoln site visit.
  - Note; CHC and Dept working towards a team based service delivery pilot on future project.
- Other issues: NC Senate Bill 22; IgCC version 2.0 public hearings in Dallas, TX May 16-22.

### 8.2. Code Compliance Report:

The Code Compliance report was given by Joe Weathers and covered the following:

- "Not ready" down ½% in Bldg, same in Elec; Mech and Plbg both up 2.5%+ (M@6.3% & P@9.8%)
- Rough/finish % split varies, some up, some down
  - Bldg; [rough @ 32.10%](#) (down 2%+), finish @ 23.66% (down 2.7%)
  - Elec; rough @ 19.38% (up 6%+), finish @ 62.28% (down 7%)
  - Mech; [rough @ 22.01%](#) (up 3%), finish @ 68.07% (up ½%)
  - Plbg; rough @ 29.16% (up7%), finish @ 43.74% (down 3.5%)
- Mostly (70-90%) repeat items in top ten defects noted in each trade.

### 8.4. Consistency Team Report

Willis Horton presented the Consistency Team report with the following information:

- Front end:
  - a) customer memo announcing changes to website
  - b) Code Compliance Report customer letter and summary sheet
- Building: held 3 meetings, 21 issues addressed, 12 QA topics developed and issued
- Electrical: January meeting was snowed out, so Feb & March meetings addressed 18 issues in QA format,
- Plumbing/Mechanical/Fuel Gas:
  - Plumbing; 21 new Q&A topics
  - Mechanical; 12 new Q&A topics
  - Fuel Gas; 4 new Q&A topics
- Note; Commercial Plan Review consistency issues are covered in building section above.

### 8.3. Commercial Plan Review Report

Tim Taylor gave a quarterly report of Commercial Plan Review/Permitting and covered the following:

#### Part I:

- 76% of projects pass on 1<sup>st</sup> rev'w; 91% have passed after 2<sup>nd</sup> rev'w
- pass rates on 1<sup>st</sup> review by trade:  
Bldg – 83%; -Elec – 92%; -Mech – 82%; Plbg – 12%;

#### Part II: most common defects: examples (most frequent almost all same as last quarter, but reordered)

- Bldg: AE seal, egress, seismic, constr type, occupancy, accessible routes
- Elec: load calcs, service eqpt location, wiring methods, service conductors, conductor types,
- Mech: ventilation/exhaust, eqpt approval, duct constr/mat'ls, piping, Energy Code, eqpt accessibility
- Plbg: water pipe req'ts, venting, minimum facilities/fixture requirements, materials, drain pipe req'ts

#### Part III: 1<sup>st</sup> rev'w use of approved as noted at 32% by all trades on the average (same as last quarter)

- biggest users; Fire (90%)
- critical path users; Bldg (34%), Elec (13%), Mech (8%), Plbg (16%), Zoning (3%)

## 9. QUARTERLY BDC BULLETIN EXERCISE

### Previous bulletin topics:

<b>April, 2009</b>  Budget impact on customers Gatekeeper changes Virtual co-location with the City of Charlotte NC transition to the 2009 NC Building Code family AE Pass Rate Incentives Program dev't progress  ISO rating report	<b>July, 2009</b>  Fy10 budget impact on customers AE Pass Rate data collection  Self-gatekeeping  NACO award on RDS-EPS Accessibility Code format change CFD single family review delay	<b>October, 2009</b>  Dept Reorganization Low voltage permits  Self-Gatekeeping transition  Accessibility Code transition AE Pass Rate Incentives Program status & timeline  GPR program status	<b>January, 2010</b>  Reorganization focus on customer centric service  Nissan ID's Meck process as best practice  Trades Internet Permits (TIP)
<b>April, 2010</b>  Fy11 budget presentation available  Green Permit Rebates suspension  Technical Advisory Board startup  New Commercial Plan Review Tools	<b>July, 2010</b>  Expanding TIP  AE Pass Rate update  Web tools for contractors  Current inspection service levels  2010 Reorg Field impact	<b>October, 2010</b>  Why Meck County is a project asset  Nissan ID's Meck process as best practice  AE Pass Rate success  Progress on reorg Plan  Field Service improvements	<b>January, 2011</b>  TAB purpose and customer participation  Technology development and budget baseline  Status of EV introduction  Elec J-man Program Pilot  Changes to <a href="http://www.meckpermit.com">www.meckpermit.com</a>
<b>April 2011</b> BIM - IPD (public hearing) Website (site feedback pages) Cost Recovery Work Group EPM Maintaining Response Times Senate Bill 22 Impact			

## 10. DEPARTMENT STATISTICS AND INITIATIVES REPORT

### 10.1. Statistics Report

#### 10.1.1. Permit Revenue

- March- \$1,291,868 with Fy11 YTD at \$8,547,612
- Fy11 projected permit revenue at March, \$944,065/month x 9 = \$8,496,585
- so at March 31, we are above permit fee revenue projection by \$51k or 0.6%

#### 10.1.1.1. Revenue/Expense Status at March 31, 2011

- See item 4

#### 10.1.2. Construction Value of Permits Issued

- March total - \$188,452,471, with YTD amount \$1,120,849,888
- Fy10 Total at March – \$1,161,025,306
- So YTD figure is down \$40.175M or 3.46% below YTD at March 2010



- Bldg & plbg down slightly; Elec up slightly; Mech up 1.27%
- Overall average, and individual disciplines still close to historic highs

#### 10.1.5.1 CFD Inspection Pass Rate for March, 2011

- CFD overall inspection pass rate of 79.79% for March, or up 5 % from February (74.79%)

#### 10.1.6. OnSchedule and CTAC Numbers for March, 2011

##### CTAC:

- 151 first reviews
  - Projects approval rate (pass/fail) – 66%
  - CTAC was 52% of OnSch (\*) first review volume (151/151+136 = 52.6%) = 52%
- \*CTAC as a % of OnSchedule is based on the total of only scheduled and Express projects

##### OnSchedule:

- April, 10: 138- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 95.87% all trades, 94.07% B/E/M/P only
  - May, 10: 95 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 97.43% all trades, 97.61% B/E/M/P only
  - June, 10: 153 - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 89.71% all trades, 91.59% B/E/M/P only
  - July, 10: 140\* - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
  - August, 10: 159\* - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 87% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
  - September, 10: 148\* - 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85% all trades, 83% B/E/M/P only
  - October, 10: 158- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 92% all trades, 90% B/E/M/P only
  - November, 10: 154- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 94% all trades, 94.25% B/E/M/P only
  - December, 10: 149- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 74.5% all trades, 80% B/E/M/P only (1)
  - January, 11: 137- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 82.65% all trades, 83.5% B/E/M/P only
  - February, 11: 136- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 86.6% all trades, 88% B/E/M/P only
  - March, 11: 136- 1st rev'w projects; on time/early – 85.75% all trades, 84.5% B/E/M/P only
- \*Indicates numbers restated from previous month to correct error in transferring #'s from report

##### Booking Lead Times

- OnSchedule Projects: **for reporting chart posted on line**, on April 4, showed
    - 1-2 hour projects; at 1work day booking lead time, except bldg at 5 days, Zoning at 4, CFD at 2
    - 3-4 hour projects; at 1work day lead time, except bldg, M/P, City Zoning and CFD at 4-6days
    - 5-8 hour projects; at 1-5 work days lead time, except bldg at 20 days, M/P at 20 days
  - CTAC plan review turnaround time; 3 work days lead time, except City Fire at 1work day
  - Express Review – booking lead time was; 20 work days for small projects, 20 work days for large
- [Note: the Department is studying the recent uptick in booking lead times in building and M/P. We are pursuing a couple of options to increase plan review hours available in those trades, and should have something to discuss in the next BDC meeting.](#)

#### 10.2. Status Report on Various Department Initiatives

##### 10.2.1. March Meeting Follow Up

###### 10.2.1.1. TAB Presentation to Charlotte Chamber Members

- JNB & Joe Weathers are scheduled to present to the Chambers Land Use Committee on April 27, 7:30 am.
- Emphasis will be on introducing the TAB's role and making attendees aware of TAB as a resource on sustainable design projects.

###### 10.2.1.2. BDC Membership Changes

- On March 15, the BOCC approved Hal Hester as the representative for the Charlotte Plumbing, Heating and Cooling Contractors Association.
- Will Caulder's nominee as rep for the General Contractors Association is still under BOCC review.

###### 10.2.2. NC BCC BIM-IPD Ad Hoc Committee Progress

- This initiative has now moved through the Ad Hoc Committee and BCC's standing Administrative and Building Code Committees.
- The proposal is currently scheduled for a public hearing at the BCC's next meeting on June 13.

- BCC Standing Committee members and the BCC Chair requested that private sector members of the Ad Hoc Committee attend the public hearing, to address particular BCC questions on the use of BIM-IPD in design and construction.
- The BCC's action after the June 13 public hearing, should lead to a final vote in their Sept. 13 meeting.

#### **10.2.3. Advance Electrical Journeyman's Program Testing Pilot**

- Work on this pilot continues. The next NCAEC administered test is scheduled for April 21.

#### **10.2.4. EV Car Qualified List of Engineers and Contractors**

- EV Qualified PE's & contractors: no status change. The Department continues working with BDC member Ed Horne and CAAEC to solicit interest in the program certifying Electrical engineers and contractors as proficient in EV supply multiple commercial installations.
  - On March 31, Gary Mullis and Tim Taylor presented at an Underwriters Laboratories EV Charging Equipment training Program, regarding the Departments work with CAAEC to create a list of qualified engineers and contractors.
- Upcoming event; the nation's premier plug-in hybrid and electric transportation conference – will be held at the Raleigh Convention Center from July 18-21, 2011. Registration is now open for the Plug-In 2011 Conference & Exposition, which will provide attendees with the latest insights from experts on the technical advances, market research and policy initiatives shaping the future of plug-in hybrid and electric transportation. More information available at [www.plugin2011.com](http://www.plugin2011.com).

### **10.3. Other**

#### **10.3.1. Announce and introduce Chuck Walker as the new Mega-OnSchedule PM**

Gene Morton announced the promotion of Chuck Walker from a Senior Plans examiner in Commercial Plan Review and Permitting to the new Mega/OnSchedule Project Manager in Commercial Plan Review and Permitting.

#### **10.3.2. Department Accepts Invitation to Participate in Auto-Plan Check Pilot**

Target is working with ICC and Solibri to develop auto-plan check software for use on BIM projects. They have a proof of concept far enough along so that they wish to check it against regional manual plan reviews. Meck County was invited to participate as one of four authorities in the US; Meck's work will represent the East Region. The review will take place sometime in May.

#### **10.4. Manager/CA Added Comments**

- No Manager added comments.
- Joe Weathers asked the BDC Members if they would like to continue receiving all raw data from the Code Compliance Report. BDC Members all agreed since this report is available on the web site to make an earth day move and save the paper.

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

The April 19<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Building Development Commission meeting adjourned at 4:51 p.m.

**NOTE:** The next BDC Meeting is scheduled for 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011. Please mark your calendar.